



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/392,106	09/08/1999	G. MICHAEL PHILLIPS	35512-00006	9570

7590 04/08/2003

STEVEN E SHAPIRO ESQ
MITCHELL SILBERGERG & KNUPP LL
11377 WEST OLYMPIC BOULEVARD
LOS ANGELES, CA 90064

EXAMINER

BASHORE, ALAIN L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/392,106

Applicant(s)

PHILLIPS ET AL.

Examiner

Alain L. Bashore

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 21 January 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-18 and 20-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandretto in view of Barber and Miller et al.

Sandretto discloses a method, apparatus and computer-readable medium for predicting a value of a target variable based on predictions of other variables. There is obtained historical values for the target variable at each of plural time points. Values are inherently assigned to parameters of a forecasting model to obtain a best fit of the values for the plural predictor variables to the historical values for the target variables. A value of the target value is predicted, from currently predicted values for at least a subset of the plural predictor variables using the forecasting model and the values assigned to the parameters of the forecasting model. The target variable is a measure of a value of a financial asset. Sandretto teaches utilizing regression techniques for assigning parameters of a forecasting model (col 4, lines 60-67; col 5, lines 1-19).

Sandretto does not appear to explicitly disclose:

the specific regression techniques of claims 3-4,15; and
obtaining previously predicted values for use with currently predicted
values for each plural predictor variable that is also used by the forecasting model.

Barber discloses obtaining previously predicted values for use with currently
predicted values for each plural predictor variable that is also used by the forecasting
model (col 1, lines 5-17; col 3, lines 30-45).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to obtain
previously predicted values for use with currently predicted values for each plural
predictor variable to be used by the forecasting model to Sandretto because Miller et al
teaches that predicative utility requires previously predictive values (col 2, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to utilized the
claimed regression techniques of claims 3-4, and 15 to Sandretto, since statistical curve
fitting, stepwise linear, and non-linear are all known in the statistical art per se and
Sandretto teaches utilizing statistical methods as a continuing focus in the art (col 6,
lines 60-67).

3. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandretto in view of Barber and Miller et al as applied to claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-18, and 20-24 above, and further in view of Barr et al.

Sandretto in view of Barber and Miller et al does not disclose a neural network technique.

Barr et al discloses neural network technique for predicting a measure of a financial asset (col 2, lines 47-53).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to utilize a neural network technique to Sandretto since Barr et al teaches advantages of using such techniques in the art (col 2, lines 40-67).

4. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sandretto in view of Barber and Miller et al as applied to claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-18, and 20-24 above, and further in view of admitted prior art (pages 7-8).

Sandretto in view of Barber and Miller et al does not explicitly disclose combination forecasts.

The admitted prior art discloses that combination forecasts are known in the art per se (pages 7-8 of applicant's disclosure).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to utilize combination forecasts instead of the forecast model in Sandretto in view of Barber and

Miller et al because both references teach forecasts models as the substitution of one forecast model for another, in absence of expected or unobvious results.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 1-21-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claimed recitations to "previously predicted values", this recitation as broadly recited, includes any past values already generated that is described in the Sandretto reference.

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to combine the use of Barber's method for "predicted values" either for the purpose of assigning parameters to a forecasting model or for predicting a value for a target variable because of what is taught by Miller.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alain L. Bashore whose telephone number is 703-308-1884. The examiner can normally be reached on about 7:30 am to 5:00 pm (Alternate Fridays Off).


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 703-308-1065. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-1113.



Alain L. Bashore
April 7, 2003



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER